

EXHIBIT A

Jerry G. Blaivas, M.D.

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA
3 AT CHARLESTON
4 -----;
IN RE ETHICON, INC., PELVIC :
5 REPAIR SYSTEM PRODUCTS : MASTER FILE
LIABILITY LITIGATION : No. 2:12-MD-02327
6 _____:
:
7 THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO : MDL 2327
ALL WAVE 3 CASES :
8 : JOSEPH R. GOODWIN
: US DISTRICT JUDGE

9 -----
10 - - -
11 August 29, 2016

12 - - -
13 DEPOSITION of JERRY G. BLAIVAS,
14 M.D., commencing at 12:00 p.m. on the above
15 date at Urocenter of New York, 445 East 77th
16 Street, New York, New York, before Marie Foley,
17 a Registered Merit Reporter, Certified Realtime
18 Reporter and Notary Public of the State of New
19 York.

20 - - -
21 GOLKOW TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
22 877.370.3377 ph | 917.591.5672 fax
23 Deps@golkow.com
24

Jerry G. Blaivas, M.D.

Page 6	Page 8
<p>1 - - -</p> <p>2 1:12 p.m.</p> <p>3 New York, New York</p> <p>4 - - -</p> <p>5 JERRY G. BLAIVAS, M.D., the Witness herein,</p> <p>6 having been first duly sworn by a Notary</p> <p>7 Public in and of the State of New York,</p> <p>8 was examined and testified as follows:</p> <p>9 EXAMINATION BY</p> <p>10 MS. FITZPATRICK:</p> <p>11 Q. Good afternoon, Dr. Blaivas.</p> <p>12 You have never given a</p> <p>13 deposition in the TVT-Exact Wave case, a</p> <p>14 general deposition, correct?</p> <p>15 A. That's correct.</p> <p>16 Q. And has Ethicon previously asked</p> <p>17 you to provide a date for the deposition</p> <p>18 in your TVT-Exact Wave report?</p> <p>19 A. They have.</p> <p>20 Q. Did you offer them the date of</p> <p>21 today, August 29th, at 12:00 for that</p> <p>22 deposition?</p> <p>23 A. I did.</p> <p>24 Q. Did you spend time prior to</p>	<p>1 Q. When was that?</p> <p>2 A. Several hours ago.</p> <p>3 Q. We are going ahead because</p> <p>4 Ethicon has waived its right to ask you</p> <p>5 any questions in relation to your report</p> <p>6 in that particular product, but I am here</p> <p>7 representing the plaintiffs and I'm going</p> <p>8 to ask you a series of questions related</p> <p>9 to the opinions in your TVT-Exact report,</p> <p>10 some of which also apply to other products</p> <p>11 as well.</p> <p>12 Do you understand that?</p> <p>13 A. I do.</p> <p>14 Q. Now, you offered a report in the</p> <p>15 TVT-Exact approximately in April of this</p> <p>16 year; is that right?</p> <p>17 A. Yes.</p> <p>18 MS. FITZPATRICK: I'm going to</p> <p>19 go ahead and mark this as Deposition</p> <p>20 Exhibit Number 1.</p> <p>21 (Blaivas Exhibit 1, Rule 26</p> <p>22 Expert Report of Jerry G. Blaivas,</p> <p>23 M.D. dated February 1, 2016, was</p> <p>24 marked for identification, as of this</p>
Page 7	Page 9
<p>1 today preparing for that TVT-Exact</p> <p>2 deposition?</p> <p>3 A. Of course.</p> <p>4 Q. Did you prepare to discuss the</p> <p>5 opinions that you have offered</p> <p>6 specifically in your TVT-Exact report</p> <p>7 today?</p> <p>8 A. I did.</p> <p>9 Q. And do many of the opinions that</p> <p>10 are contained in the TVT-Exact report</p> <p>11 overlap with the opinions that you have</p> <p>12 also given in the TVT Retropubic, TVT-O</p> <p>13 and TVT-S and TVT Abbrevio reports?</p> <p>14 A. They do.</p> <p>15 Q. In addition to that, there are</p> <p>16 some new opinions that you offer that are</p> <p>17 specific to the TVT-Exact as well,</p> <p>18 correct?</p> <p>19 A. Yes.</p> <p>20 Q. At some point this morning, were</p> <p>21 you made aware that Ethicon had</p> <p>22 unilaterally cancelled your deposition in</p> <p>23 this TVT-Exact matter?</p> <p>24 A. Yes.</p>	<p>1 date.)</p> <p>2 BY MS. FITZPATRICK:</p> <p>3 Q. Doctor, what you have in front</p> <p>4 of you is a report in the TVT-Exact cases,</p> <p>5 correct?</p> <p>6 A. Correct.</p> <p>7 Q. Now, before we get to specifics</p> <p>8 of some of your opinions, I want to</p> <p>9 discuss with you some of your</p> <p>10 qualifications and some of the bases for</p> <p>11 the opinions that you have offered in this</p> <p>12 report.</p> <p>13 You clinically treat women who</p> <p>14 have stress urinary incontinence, correct?</p> <p>15 A. I do.</p> <p>16 Q. Approximately how many women</p> <p>17 have you treated who deal with stress</p> <p>18 urinary incontinence?</p> <p>19 A. Oh, my goodness. Thousands.</p> <p>20 Q. Do you offer surgical</p> <p>21 alternatives to women who present to you</p> <p>22 with stress urinary incontinence?</p> <p>23 A. Of course.</p> <p>24 Q. And what are those surgical</p>

Jerry G. Blaivas, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 14</p> <p>1 are not caused by the polypropylene 2 midurethral sling? 3 A. Yes. 4 Q. And it's fair to say that in 5 your clinical practice, there are times 6 that you diagnose women's complications as 7 being related to the polypropylene 8 midurethral sling that they have? 9 A. Yes. 10 Q. When a woman presents to you 11 with a complication that you then 12 determine after examination is caused by a 13 midurethral sling, what treatment options 14 do you offer to that woman? 15 A. Well, it depends what the 16 complication is. Generally, and these are 17 very -- you know, it depends what the 18 complication is. If it's clearly an 19 obstruction from the sling, and when there 20 is an obstruction that's what it usually 21 is, then my recommendation is that we 22 remove the entire suburethral portion of 23 the sling. 24 If the complication is a</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 16</p> <p>1 woman's specific problems? 2 A. Of course. 3 Q. And would you say that you try 4 to treat the problems as conservatively as 5 possible, with the least amount of surgery 6 necessary to correct those problems? 7 A. No, I would say I try to be 8 appropriate. I mean, sometimes it's 9 appropriate to be conservative. Sometimes 10 it's appropriate to be radical, but I 11 discuss it with the patient. 12 Q. Okay. Now, in addition to your 13 clinical work and your clinical 14 experience, you also have done academic 15 work and published articles concerning 16 mesh and mesh complications, correct? 17 A. I have. 18 Q. And most recently you published 19 an article entitled "Safety Considerations 20 for Synthetic Sling Surgery" that was 21 published in the Nature Reviews of Urology 22 in 2015, correct? 23 A. Yes. 24 Q. And you were a co-author on that</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 15</p> <p>1 fistula, then we remove all of the sling, 2 all of the sub -- all of the sling that's 3 in the vicinity of the urethra -- excuse 4 me, of the fistula and then repair the 5 fistula. 6 If it's pain, then it depends 7 where the pain is, and again I don't have 8 to go into the particulars, but sometimes 9 we just remove that portion that appears 10 to be related or causing the pain, but 11 sometimes we remove the entire mesh 'cause 12 I think the entire mesh is causing the 13 pain. 14 If it's overactive bladder 15 symptoms, we -- if it's due to urethral 16 obstruction, we remove the suburethral 17 portion. If we're not -- if it seems like 18 it's in the wall of the bladder but -- or 19 through the wall of the bladder, then we 20 remove all of the sling on that side and 21 sometimes the entire sling. 22 Q. Is it fair to say based on what 23 you've just told me that the treatment 24 options that you offer are tailored to a</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 17</p> <p>1 with eight other individuals, correct? 2 A. Yes. 3 Q. Can you tell me, first of all, 4 how this article came to be? 5 A. Well, Nature Reviews in Urology 6 is a highly respected peer review journal, 7 and they, for their reviews they actually 8 solicit authors. I don't believe you can 9 just submit. I'm not sure of that. 10 But they asked me to do a review 11 article, and they told me right up front 12 that just because I agreed to do it, it 13 did not mean that it would be automatically 14 accepted. 15 Q. Now, can you tell us what a 16 review article is? 17 A. A review article is, there are 18 lots of different types, but basically 19 it's a compilation of many and sometimes 20 all of the articles in the peer review 21 literature about a certain topic. And 22 then, so the first thing that you do is 23 you -- is you do a literature search and 24 you identify the articles and then you use</p>

Jerry G. Blaivas, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 18</p> <p>1 search criteria to eliminate certain 2 articles and then you analyze them based 3 on whatever methodology you choose. 4 Q. So, let me discuss, you were 5 approached by Nature and asked to conduct 6 a review on the literature available 7 concerning synthetic sling surgery, 8 correct? 9 A. Yes. 10 Q. And, I see that we mentioned you 11 have a number of other authors here. 12 Are those authors that you asked 13 to help you with this, or are those 14 authors that Nature assigned to this 15 project? 16 A. No, I got to select my team. 17 Q. Can you tell me how you went 18 about selecting the team? 19 A. Sure. Well, okay, so, two of 20 the co-authors, Robert Bendavid and 21 Vladimir Latovlev, L-A-T-O-V-L-E-V, are 22 recognized authorities in the field, and I 23 asked them if they would be willing to 24 help me with this.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20</p> <p>1 why they selected you or asked you to 2 write this article over others? 3 A. Well, yes, they had heard -- 4 one, they heard about me, they knew of me 5 and they asked around and they asked who 6 would be a good person to do it, and I 7 believe someone had seen me participate in 8 a debate at the annual meeting of the 9 American Urologic Association. 10 Q. Was there any kind of 11 preconceived outcome that anyone had 12 discussed with you of what they expected 13 your research to show or not show? 14 A. No. 15 Q. Now, this article that you did, 16 a review article, does not contain all of 17 the articles available in the medical 18 literature that reference or concern 19 midurethral slings, correct? 20 A. Correct. 21 Q. How did you and your co-authors 22 determine and choose the articles that you 23 relied on for this particular piece? 24 A. Well, two ways. One, and I'm</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 19</p> <p>1 One of them, Roger Purohit, 2 P-U-R-O-H-I-T, is my partner, so we 3 operate together and he has a considerable 4 amount of clinical experience. And then 5 Matt Benden and Gabriel Mekel, M-E-K-E-L, 6 and Michael Stern and Mubashir Billah, 7 B-I-L-L-A-H, and I'll have to spell the 8 other ones, K-O-L-A is the first name and 9 it's O-L-U-G-B-A-D-E, were all students 10 that -- well, actually, Dr. Mekel was 11 doing a fellowship with me and the others 12 are either medical students, or are all 13 medical students. 14 Q. Okay. When did Nature approach 15 you about authoring a review on synthetic 16 sling surgery? 17 A. It was some time after May of, I 18 guess, 20 -- I don't know if it was 2013 19 or -- probably -- or 2014. I can't 20 remember. 21 Q. Okay. 22 A. But it was after the American 23 Urologic Association national meeting. 24 Q. Did anyone from Nature tell you</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 21</p> <p>1 sorry, I don't have all the details in my 2 memory, but there was an article 3 published -- there was another review 4 article that I thought was timely that did 5 a review up to a certain date and then 6 we -- I just decided to do it from about 7 that time to the what was then current, 8 which was 2014. And I can tell you in a 9 minute what the dates were. 10 Q. Sure. 11 (Pause.) 12 A. So, it was from 2007 to 2014. 13 Excuse me, that was for the 14 clinical review, okay. Dr. Latovlev 15 independently reviewed the pathology which 16 went back many years before that. 17 Q. One of the things that I want to 18 talk to you about today is the conclusions 19 that you reached concerning the 20 complications and the complication rates 21 associated with midurethral slings. 22 Would that be included in the 23 clinical review that you just mentioned? 24 A. Yes.</p>

Jerry G. Blaivas, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 22</p> <p>1 Q. So, you and your co-authors 2 chose articles written from 2007 to 2014, 3 and I think what you mentioned to me 4 before was that there's certain search 5 criteria that you use when conducting your 6 literature search to determine what 7 articles would be included in a review 8 article; is that right? 9 A. Yes. 10 Q. And can you tell me what the 11 search criteria that you and your 12 co-authors were? 13 A. It's a long list. Shall I read 14 it to you? 15 Q. Sure. 16 A. Okay. So, the search combined 17 the terms, and some of these are just 18 spelling things. So, there was 19 midurethral slings where "mid" and 20 "urethral" are two words; midurethral 21 slings where "midurethral" is one word; 22 suburethral sling, urethral sling, 23 midurethral slings with a plural, both 24 words again with a plural. All of the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24</p> <p>1 we did on the clinical end. 2 Q. Okay. And that sounds like 3 quite a number of search terms; is that 4 right? 5 A. Yes. 6 Q. Why did you have so many search 7 terms? 8 A. 'Cause we didn't want to miss 9 any articles, and what we did is we would 10 look up -- we started with less search 11 terms and as we read articles, we would 12 see synonyms or new words and then we 13 would add that to the search term. 14 Q. Did you limit the types of 15 articles you were looking at? For 16 example, did you only look at randomized 17 control trials or only look at 18 meta-analyses or only look at case 19 studies? 20 A. No, we did not limit it. 21 Q. Is it fair to say that you were 22 trying to get as big a cross-section or as 23 big a representation of all of the 24 articles out there and kind of gather them</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 23</p> <p>1 words that I just said also in plural. 2 Follow-up study, other than all of those 3 terms and follow-up study. 4 Also, we used free text searches 5 including the terms urinary 6 incontinence -- excuse me, TVT, tension 7 free vaginal tape, tension free vaginal 8 sling, transobturator tape, transobturator 9 sling, TVT-Obturator, TVT-O, TVT Secure, 10 Minarc, that's M-I-N-A-R-C, Abbrevio, 11 A-B-B-R-E-V-I-O, TOT, suprapubic arc 12 sling, Sparc, S-P-A-R-C, sling, 13 intravaginal slingplasty, IVS sling, RAZ, 14 R-A-Z, sling, Uratape, that's 15 U-R-A-T-A-P-E, ObTape, O-B-T-A-P-E, 16 prepubic sling, prepubic TVT, prepubic 17 tape, Pelvilace, P-E-L-V-I-L-A-C-E, 18 ureter, Aris, A-R-I-S, In-Fast, 19 I-N-F-A-S-T, Monarc I-STOP, urethral 20 reconstruction, urethral vaginal fistula, 21 other spelling of ObTape, Gore-Tex sling, 22 silastic sling, Mersilene sling, Marlex 23 sling, vesicovaginal fistula, Bioarc. And 24 then -- yeah, so that was the search that</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 25</p> <p>1 up before you got started with this 2 process? 3 A. Yes. I just remembered there 4 was actually, there was one exclusion 5 criteria that we used. If an article by 6 the same authors seemed to include the 7 same patients in a different study, we 8 would have used the most -- either the 9 most recent one or the most appropriate 10 one. We tried not to count the same 11 patients twice. 12 Q. Okay. 13 A. So if one author had a 14 patient -- had a study that showed the 15 patients at one year, five years, 10 16 years, 15 years and 20 years, and they had 17 complications, we wouldn't count the 18 complications five times. We'd only count 19 the complications once. 20 Q. Okay. Is it fair to say that 21 you were attempting to count each patient 22 one time and not duplicate those patients 23 or those complications in your analysis at 24 all?</p>

Jerry G. Blaivas, M.D.

Page 26	Page 28
<p>1 A. Exactly.</p> <p>2 Q. And the method that you used to</p> <p>3 do that by only using one article from a</p> <p>4 series, is that a standard acceptable way</p> <p>5 of achieving that goal when doing medical</p> <p>6 or scientific research?</p> <p>7 A. You know, I don't know.</p> <p>8 Q. Tell me why you thought that it</p> <p>9 was an appropriate way to achieve that</p> <p>10 result.</p> <p>11 A. Because I wanted to be sure on</p> <p>12 the one hand that we captured every</p> <p>13 complication, but on the other hand we</p> <p>14 didn't count anybody twice 'cause we were</p> <p>15 looking to get as precise a number for</p> <p>16 both -- for complications as we could. We</p> <p>17 didn't want to overestimate; we didn't</p> <p>18 want to underestimate.</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. And that's for the</p> <p>20 clinical portion, and clinically you</p> <p>21 looked at both the safety of the product,</p> <p>22 correct, the complications?</p> <p>23 A. Yes.</p> <p>24 Q. And you also looked at the</p>	<p>1 dealt with high rates of complications?</p> <p>2 A. No.</p> <p>3 Q. Did you only look for articles</p> <p>4 that reported low rates of complications?</p> <p>5 A. No. We intend -- to the best of</p> <p>6 our ability, we picked every article in</p> <p>7 the literature in that time period.</p> <p>8 Q. And that are articles that</p> <p>9 reflected some lower rates of</p> <p>10 complications, correct?</p> <p>11 A. Of course.</p> <p>12 Q. And articles that reflected</p> <p>13 higher rates of complication, correct?</p> <p>14 A. Yes.</p> <p>15 Q. And fair to say it included case</p> <p>16 studies?</p> <p>17 A. Yes, it did.</p> <p>18 Q. It included randomized control</p> <p>19 trials?</p> <p>20 A. Yes.</p> <p>21 Q. It included meta-analyses?</p> <p>22 A. Yes.</p> <p>23 Q. Is there anything at all that</p> <p>24 you or your co-authors did to limit or</p>
Page 27	Page 29
<p>1 efficacy of the product, correct?</p> <p>2 A. Yes.</p> <p>3 Q. Was there different criteria</p> <p>4 that you looked at for articles relating</p> <p>5 to efficacy?</p> <p>6 A. Yes. For articles for efficacy</p> <p>7 we only included those articles that</p> <p>8 measured efficacy, that had appropriate</p> <p>9 follow-up, and we did have criteria for</p> <p>10 that.</p> <p>11 Q. Is that different from -- it</p> <p>12 sounds like you had more exclusion</p> <p>13 criteria for the efficacy articles than</p> <p>14 you did the complication/safety articles;</p> <p>15 is that right?</p> <p>16 A. Yes.</p> <p>17 Q. Is there anything else that you</p> <p>18 excluded beyond, from your literature</p> <p>19 search, beyond the subsequent articles or</p> <p>20 the multi-reported cases?</p> <p>21 A. Yes. The only other exclusion</p> <p>22 was non-human subjects.</p> <p>23 Q. Did you in any way cherry pick</p> <p>24 or look only for reports or articles that</p>	<p>1 exclude certain articles or certain</p> <p>2 findings in articles that would otherwise</p> <p>3 have been encompassed in your search</p> <p>4 terms?</p> <p>5 A. Only for the efficacy studies.</p> <p>6 Q. Okay. Now --</p> <p>7 A. And that -- but those were a</p> <p>8 search term, so we -- so I guess the</p> <p>9 answer is no, we did not. Okay.</p> <p>10 Q. Now, could somebody look at what</p> <p>11 you've reported in Table 1 relating to the</p> <p>12 efficacy issues and extrapolate in any way</p> <p>13 what you did there and apply it to the</p> <p>14 complication tables that you reflected in</p> <p>15 Table 2, 3, 4 and 5?</p> <p>16 A. No, you couldn't because they</p> <p>17 didn't apply -- none of these -- well,</p> <p>18 most of these studies did not have any</p> <p>19 scientifically valid prospective way of</p> <p>20 looking at complications. This was just</p> <p>21 for efficacy.</p> <p>22 Q. Is there any way that someone</p> <p>23 could --</p> <p>24 MS. FITZPATRICK: Let me ask it</p>

Jerry G. Blaivas, M.D.

Page 30	Page 32
<p>1 a different way.</p> <p>2 Q. Is it correct that there are</p> <p>3 articles that you considered for your</p> <p>4 safety considerations or complication</p> <p>5 rates that are not reflected in the table</p> <p>6 concerning efficacy?</p> <p>7 A. Probably not because we would</p> <p>8 always -- no, because we would -- we</p> <p>9 would -- if there was even one</p> <p>10 complication, we would -- we would have</p> <p>11 included it.</p> <p>12 Q. But just because you had it, and</p> <p>13 I think what you're telling me is all of</p> <p>14 your efficacy articles were included in</p> <p>15 your complication analysis, and I'm</p> <p>16 actually asking the opposite.</p> <p>17 Were all of the articles that</p> <p>18 you considered for the complication part</p> <p>19 all used also to look at efficacy?</p> <p>20 A. No.</p> <p>21 Q. So you can't say that simply</p> <p>22 because something isn't on the Table 1</p> <p>23 that you didn't rely on it, use it,</p> <p>24 conclude anything about it or consider it</p>	<p>1 Q. And you've also been editor of a</p> <p>2 journal that is a peer review journal,</p> <p>3 correct?</p> <p>4 A. Yes.</p> <p>5 Q. Can you tell me generally in the</p> <p>6 medical and scientific community how</p> <p>7 individuals get selected as peer</p> <p>8 reviewers?</p> <p>9 A. Sure. They get selected by a</p> <p>10 process of usually by a committee of</p> <p>11 experts that picks other experts that they</p> <p>12 think contribute to the peer review</p> <p>13 process. So they have to show -- they</p> <p>14 have to be held in high regard as experts</p> <p>15 that can give a fair and unbiased</p> <p>16 appraisal of submissions.</p> <p>17 Q. Do you know of any peer review</p> <p>18 publication that has considered the</p> <p>19 opinions of attorneys from medical device</p> <p>20 manufacturers as part of peer review</p> <p>21 process?</p> <p>22 A. No, I do not.</p> <p>23 Q. Why aren't attorneys for medical</p> <p>24 device manufacturers qualified to serve as</p>
Page 31	Page 33
<p>1 as part of your safety considerations and</p> <p>2 complication considerations; is that</p> <p>3 right?</p> <p>4 A. To the contrary; we would have</p> <p>5 used it.</p> <p>6 Q. Okay. Now, this article went</p> <p>7 through the peer review process, correct?</p> <p>8 A. Very much so.</p> <p>9 Q. Can you tell me what you mean by</p> <p>10 that?</p> <p>11 A. Well, the peer review process</p> <p>12 itself is designed to insure that the</p> <p>13 highest standards of scientific</p> <p>14 methodology were used in the paper and</p> <p>15 very specifically that the results and the</p> <p>16 conclusions follow from the methodology;</p> <p>17 i.e. that the conclusions follow from the</p> <p>18 methods.</p> <p>19 Q. Is there anything that was</p> <p>20 different about the Nature peer --</p> <p>21 MS. FITZPATRICK: Strike that.</p> <p>22 Q. You've worked as a peer reviewer</p> <p>23 before, correct, for other journals?</p> <p>24 A. Yes.</p>	<p>1 peer reviewers for a medical journal?</p> <p>2 A. Well, the most obvious reason is</p> <p>3 that their opinions were likely to be</p> <p>4 biased or that they have a major conflict</p> <p>5 of interest and they don't fulfill our</p> <p>6 criteria for being an expert. They're</p> <p>7 lawyers; they're not experts in</p> <p>8 scientific research.</p> <p>9 Q. Is it fair to say that the peer</p> <p>10 review process is designed to have</p> <p>11 neutral, objective, experienced</p> <p>12 individuals assessing the methodology and</p> <p>13 the conclusions that are reached in</p> <p>14 medical and scientific journals?</p> <p>15 A. Of course.</p> <p>16 Q. That process is designed to</p> <p>17 insure that the methodology that is used</p> <p>18 is something that is recognized and</p> <p>19 acceptable in the medical and scientific</p> <p>20 community, correct?</p> <p>21 A. Yes.</p> <p>22 Q. In your experience as both a</p> <p>23 peer reviewer and as an editor of a peer</p> <p>24 review journal, what happens in the</p>

Jerry G. Blaivas, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 34</p> <p>1 process if an article is presented that 2 does not use established accepted 3 methodology in the scientific and medical 4 community? 5 A. Well, as a general rule, it's 6 rejected. On rare occasions, someone 7 comes up with such a novel approach that 8 even though that it wasn't known before, 9 it might become -- it might be acceptable. 10 Q. Do you believe that the peer 11 review -- let me ask you this. 12 Tell me about the peer review 13 process that you went through for your 14 Nature article. 15 A. This was the most rigorous peer 16 review that I've ever been part of. I 17 mean, we -- this article took more time 18 and more effort than any article I've ever 19 written, and I, you know, I've done 20 hundreds and hundreds. So it was a very 21 labor intense project. We read all of the 22 articles, and then when we wrote the 23 articles, we submitted it and they had a 24 number of questions, concerns, suggested</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 36</p> <p>1 methodology in connection with that 2 article at any time prior to its 3 publication? 4 A. Well, they asked questions about 5 it in the review process, but I don't -- 6 but afterwards, no, I don't -- I'm not 7 aware of anybody questioning it. 8 Q. And are you comfortable that the 9 Nature Review Urology looked closely at 10 the methodology that you and your 11 co-authors used to reach the conclusions 12 that you did in that review paper? 13 A. I'm quite confident of that. 14 Q. We're going to talk in a little 15 bit specific about some of the conclusions 16 in that article and I'm going to ask you 17 more specifically how you reached the 18 conclusions that you did. 19 But, in addition to the 20 conclusions that you reached in that 21 article, you also rely on your clinical 22 experience for an independent basis of 23 your TVT-Exact report, correct? 24 A. Yes.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 35</p> <p>1 revisions and it went back and forth a 2 number of times to be sure that we -- that 3 our -- to be sure, quite honestly, that 4 our, as I mentioned a few minutes ago is 5 that our results and conclusions were 6 clearly supported by the methodology and 7 that they were scientifically sound. 8 Q. Do you believe, Doctor, that the 9 fact that your article in Nature Review 10 survived the peer review process 11 establishes that the methodology that you 12 and your co-authors used in that, in 13 drafting that article, was scientifically 14 reliable? 15 A. I do. 16 Q. Would it be widely considered in 17 your medical community that an article 18 such as yours that has gone through such a 19 rigorous peer review process has 20 demonstrated appropriate medical and 21 scientific methodology? 22 A. Yes. 23 Q. Has anybody in the medical 24 community or at Nature questioned your</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 37</p> <p>1 Q. And including those portions 2 that overlap with the other polypropylene 3 midurethral sling products that you've 4 offered reports on, correct? 5 A. Yes. 6 Q. In addition to your Nature 7 article, in addition to your clinical 8 experience, did you also rely on 9 peer-reviewed literature which was 10 identified both in the footnotes of your 11 report and then in the reliance list that 12 you provided with that report? 13 A. I did. 14 Q. In selecting that peer-reviewed 15 literature for inclusion in your report or 16 your reliance list, were there any 17 articles that you just dismissed out of 18 hand and refused to consider when reaching 19 the opinions that you have in this case? 20 A. I don't dismiss them out of 21 hand. I mean, there's some that I don't 22 agree with the methodology. 23 I mean, are you asking in 24 general?</p>

Jerry G. Blaivas, M.D.

Page 38	Page 40
<p>1 Q. Would you ever look at an</p> <p>2 article and say well, there's only a .1</p> <p>3 complication rate, so I'm not even going</p> <p>4 to look or consider that article?</p> <p>5 A. No, I don't do that.</p> <p>6 Q. Tell me what you do when you</p> <p>7 look at articles to determine that you</p> <p>8 think, or what weight you should be giving</p> <p>9 to those particular articles.</p> <p>10 A. Generally, first thing I do is</p> <p>11 look at the results of the -- basically I</p> <p>12 basically look at the conclusions first</p> <p>13 and then I look at the methodology and</p> <p>14 say -- confirm that the conclusions could</p> <p>15 be justified by the methodology. If the</p> <p>16 methodology is such that it can't even</p> <p>17 answer the questions that the conclusions</p> <p>18 concluded, I would still look at the</p> <p>19 paper, but I would -- I would tend to not</p> <p>20 read that in great depth. And then if the</p> <p>21 two go hand in hand, then I look at the</p> <p>22 results and make sure that the results</p> <p>23 follow from the methods as well.</p> <p>24 Q. In your both clinical and</p>	<p>1 A. Yes.</p> <p>2 Q. Do you see that?</p> <p>3 A. I do.</p> <p>4 Q. Looking at your Nature article,</p> <p>5 you also looked at incidents of bladder</p> <p>6 and transvaginal trocar perforation, some</p> <p>7 of the complications that were reported in</p> <p>8 the medical literature, correct?</p> <p>9 A. I do.</p> <p>10 Q. Let's start with do you rely on</p> <p>11 any of your clinical experience for your</p> <p>12 opinion that it is common for trocars to</p> <p>13 puncture the bladder or urethra during</p> <p>14 trocar passage?</p> <p>15 A. I do.</p> <p>16 Q. And how does your clinical</p> <p>17 experience specifically support your</p> <p>18 opinion that it is common for trocars to</p> <p>19 puncture the bladder or urethra during</p> <p>20 trocar passage?</p> <p>21 A. Well, from my clinical</p> <p>22 experience, when I -- first of all, I talk</p> <p>23 to a lot of my peers and colleagues about</p> <p>24 it and I simply ask them in the hospital.</p>
Page 39	Page 41
<p>1 academic practice, do you regularly and</p> <p>2 routinely read articles that appear in the</p> <p>3 medical and scientific literature about</p> <p>4 polypropylene slings?</p> <p>5 A. I do.</p> <p>6 Q. Are those also brought to your</p> <p>7 attention by colleagues of yours?</p> <p>8 A. Yes.</p> <p>9 Q. Do you consider all of those</p> <p>10 articles as part of --</p> <p>11 MS. FITZPATRICK: Excuse me.</p> <p>12 Q. Do you consider all of those</p> <p>13 articles prior to reaching the conclusions</p> <p>14 that you've set forth in your expert</p> <p>15 report?</p> <p>16 A. I consider them, yes.</p> <p>17 Q. Okay. Now, I want to ask you a</p> <p>18 couple of questions, specifically about</p> <p>19 what's in your report.</p> <p>20 In paragraph 17 of your report</p> <p>21 that you have in front of you, you note</p> <p>22 that it is common for trocars to puncture</p> <p>23 the bladder or urethra during trocar</p> <p>24 passage.</p>	<p>1 I -- in over two thousand cases that I've</p> <p>2 done without mesh, there's only been one</p> <p>3 time that I perforated the -- the bladder,</p> <p>4 and when that happened, I was personally</p> <p>5 really taken aback and I kind of made a</p> <p>6 big deal about it. And the resident said,</p> <p>7 "What are you doing? Why are you so</p> <p>8 upset?" I said, "Geez, well, we just</p> <p>9 perforated the bladder." And the resident</p> <p>10 said, "Well, yeah, happens all the time</p> <p>11 with -- it happens all the time with the</p> <p>12 midurethral slings." That's one -- that's</p> <p>13 one point of information.</p> <p>14 Second is, as I mentioned, I</p> <p>15 talk to my colleagues and my peers a lot</p> <p>16 about this stuff and they, virtually all</p> <p>17 of them, almost all of them say that it</p> <p>18 does happen periodically that they</p> <p>19 perforate the bladder.</p> <p>20 Q. But --</p> <p>21 A. And then --</p> <p>22 Q. Sorry. Go ahead.</p> <p>23 A. And then finally, I've seen</p> <p>24 hundreds of patients that have had</p>

Jerry G. Blaivas, M.D.

Page 42	Page 44
<p>1 complications from slings, and when I 2 review those operative notes, they not 3 infrequently say that they perforated the 4 bladder. 5 Q. Okay. 6 A. And then took it out and passed 7 it again. 8 Q. But you don't rely just on the 9 anecdotal stories from colleagues or 10 looking at your report to reach your 11 opinion that it's common for trocars to 12 puncture the bladder or urethra during 13 passage, correct? 14 A. Of course not. 15 Q. What else do you rely on for 16 that opinion? 17 A. On the published literature. 18 Q. Can you identify any 19 peer-reviewed published literature that 20 you have seen that you rely on to support 21 your opinions that it's common for these 22 punctures to happen? 23 A. Sure. There's an article by 24 Albo, I think it was -- I think it was</p>	<p>1 the beholder, but I think there's ample 2 literature to show that it happens on the 3 order of magnitude of five percent. In 4 series it's as high as 20 or 30 percent. 5 Q. And is that something that you 6 also looked at in connection with your 7 Nature Review article? 8 A. Yes. 9 Q. Can you tell me what you did in 10 your Nature Review article to look at this 11 incidence of trocar puncture of the 12 bladder or urethra? 13 A. Well, that we just compiled all 14 the articles in the literature because 15 there wouldn't be a case report -- all of 16 the -- all of the articles that were 17 reviewed and we just averaged the -- we 18 gave a range and an average and a mean of 19 how often it was perforated. 20 Q. Okay. So, let me stop you there 21 because I want to talk a little bit more 22 about the methodology that you used not 23 just for calculating trocars, but for 24 calculating all of the rates of</p>
Page 43	Page 45
<p>1 2012, that was reported in the Journal of 2 Urology that found an incidence of, I 3 forget the exact number, either five or 4 six percent were perforated. And in the 5 AUA guidelines, Roger Dmochowski published 6 that in, he was the lead author, in 20 -- 7 actually, I don't remember the year, but 8 that also had a similar incidence of about 9 five or six percent. 10 Q. Are those the only articles that 11 you rely on? 12 A. No, there's many other ones. 13 Q. And are many of those articles 14 also cited in your reliance list -- 15 A. Yes. 16 Q. -- that you provided in this 17 case? 18 A. Yes. 19 Q. Do you believe that there's 20 sufficient peer-reviewed published 21 literature to support the opinion that 22 it's common for trocars to puncture the 23 bladder or urethra during trocar passage? 24 A. Well, common is in the eyes of</p>	<p>1 complications. 2 Was bladder or urethra puncture 3 during trocar passage one of the 4 complications that you looked at and 5 considered in your Nature Review article? 6 A. It was. 7 Q. What I'd like you to do is to 8 walk me through you and your co-authors 9 compile all of the literature that you can 10 find from an extensive literature search 11 that report any complications or any 12 incident of complications from either an 13 individual patient or a patient cohort; is 14 that correct? 15 A. Yes. 16 Q. And you looked for everything 17 you could find; is that right? 18 A. Yes. 19 Q. And you didn't exclude any 20 articles unless it was a multiple 21 reporting of the same cohort? 22 A. Or non-humans. 23 Q. Or non-humans, okay. 24 And your reason for excluding</p>

Jerry G. Blaivas, M.D.

Page 46

1 multiple reports of the same cohort is you
 2 didn't want to double count injuries, so
 3 therefore potentially inflating the rates
 4 of complications that you were looking at;
 5 is that right?
 6 A. Yes.
 7 Q. You were attempting to keep it
 8 one patient counted for one time
 9 throughout this analysis that you did,
 10 correct?
 11 A. Yes.
 12 Q. So you and your colleagues have
 13 this massive medical literature in front
 14 of you.
 15 What did you do with that
 16 information to reach the conclusions that
 17 you reached in your article concerning the
 18 existence of certain complications and
 19 then the incidence of those complications?
 20 A. Well, for the incidence we
 21 counted every single complication. So, to
 22 make it simple, if there were only two
 23 articles, one had a hundred patients and
 24 no, in this instance, perforations and one

Page 47

1 was a case report of one complication with
 2 no denominator because it's just a case
 3 report, we would use the one as the
 4 numerator and the denominator would be the
 5 101.
 6 Q. Okay.
 7 A. But of course this was done in
 8 hundreds of papers, so it was much more
 9 complicated than that.
 10 Q. So let me, as a non-scientist
 11 and non-medical person, let me see if I'm
 12 right in my understanding.
 13 You took and counted every
 14 patient who was included in all of those
 15 articles and you counted them all up and
 16 that became your denominator, the total
 17 number of people who have been studied,
 18 reported, considered in some way in the
 19 medical literature as potentially, or as a
 20 subject in a study about mesh
 21 complications; is that right?
 22 A. Yes.
 23 Q. And then you took that entire
 24 denominator and then what you did is you

Page 48

1 went through and you added up each, for
 2 example in this case, each incident of
 3 bladder or urethral trocar perforation
 4 that you could find anywhere in that
 5 medical literature; is that right?
 6 A. Yes.
 7 Q. What did you do with those two
 8 numbers to reach the percentages in the
 9 conclusions that you reached?
 10 A. Well, we just added them up. So
 11 the numerator is the number and the -- the
 12 numerator divided by the denominator is
 13 the percent.
 14 Q. And that's the methodology that
 15 was reviewed by the neutral peer reviewers
 16 for Nature Journal of Urology, correct?
 17 A. Yes. I mean, we also did -- we
 18 did it another -- the other way we did it
 19 is we looked at the range and the averages
 20 for each -- for when there's a -- when
 21 there were a series.
 22 So, if there were two series and
 23 one had, you know, a hundred patients with
 24 zero perforations, another one had a

Page 49

1 hundred patients with 20 percent, you
 2 know, we would say that the range in the
 3 different series was zero to 20 percent
 4 and the mean of the series was whatever
 5 the numbers comes to.
 6 Q. So you have two different ways
 7 that you've gone about this analysis and
 8 the two different methodologies.
 9 The first is the adding up all
 10 of the individual women who are identified
 11 and doing the numerator and the
 12 denominator, and you did that specifically
 13 for each complication individually,
 14 correct?
 15 A. Yes.
 16 Q. So you'd calculate the number of
 17 women who had a bladder perforation
 18 separately from the number of women who
 19 had a urethral erosion, separate from the
 20 number of women who had a pain
 21 complication; is that right?
 22 A. Yeah, we'd count each of them
 23 separately, yeah.
 24 Q. And you also broke that down

Jerry G. Blaivas, M.D.

Page 58	Page 60
<p>1 went about calculating the percentage of 2 patients who have a potential complication 3 based on what's available in the medical 4 literature; is that right? 5 A. Yes. 6 Q. Now, the next column is 7 "Incident mean range." 8 That's the second way that you 9 went about also checking on the reports of 10 complications and the incidence of 11 complications, correct? 12 A. Yes. 13 Q. Can you explain to me how the 14 methodology for reaching the incidence 15 differs from the methodology used for 16 reaching the complications? 17 A. Sure. In the first case, we 18 counted every single patient, every single 19 patient was counted once. In the 20 incidence, where it says "Incidence mean 21 and range," those -- that we only 22 considered series of patients. So that 23 doesn't include any of the patients 24 with -- that were case reports. It</p>	<p>1 that you had and the mean. 2 How do you account for that? 3 A. Because in the series, they may 4 not have mentioned a certain complication. 5 So for example, if you're looking at that 6 same column, if you look at neurologic 7 symptoms within six weeks, in the middle 8 column we counted every single patient 9 where they mentioned it. Now, it looks 10 like there were only 42 patients in that 11 particular group where they said these 12 patients had these complications. Whereas 13 in the other article, they could have had 14 a paper with a thousand patients in it, 15 but they didn't even mention whether or 16 not there was a neurologic complication, 17 so we couldn't count that. 18 Q. And in any event, let me look at 19 the range. So, tell me what the range is. 20 A. Well, the range is -- describes 21 what the minimum complication rate was in 22 one series and the maximum in another -- 23 in other series, and the reason that we 24 did that is one of the critiques that you</p>
Page 59	Page 61
<p>1 doesn't include any of the patients, for 2 example, that were just a paper on 3 complications. 4 So the numbers in these two 5 columns, even though they both represent 6 means or averages, the numbers could be 7 very different because they're different 8 populations of papers. 9 Q. So, this was the way that you 10 and your co-authors went about presenting 11 the full gamut of information based on two 12 statistical analyses, correct? 13 A. Exactly. 14 Q. And you reported on both the 15 complications and the incidence without 16 consideration to what was higher or lower? 17 You made sure everything was reported 18 here, correct? 19 A. Exactly. 20 Q. In some of these, the numbers 21 are fairly comparable, right? 22 A. Yes. 23 Q. And in some of them there's some 24 divergence in the percentage of patients</p>	<p>1 might apply to this kind of scientific 2 literature is, well, if you just do an 3 average -- if you just do an average, it 4 doesn't tell you about the difference 5 between perhaps, this is a perhaps, people 6 that are really expert surgeons might get 7 a zero complication rate and novices 8 might, you know, get a 15 percent 9 complication rates. 10 So this gives you the range of 11 what you might expect with the same 12 surgeon or groups of surgeons doing the 13 operation. 14 Q. In looking at both your 15 percentage of patients, as well as the 16 mean that you have reported in this 17 article, all of those fall within below 18 the highest reported incident rate on the 19 range; is that right? 20 A. Sure. That makes sense. 21 Q. So, does that reflect that your 22 article is not reporting the highest 23 possible rates of complications associated 24 with any of these complications?</p>

Jerry G. Blaivas, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 62</p> <p>1 A. To the contrary. We describe in 2 the paper that we believe this represents 3 the least possible number of complications. 4 Q. And it's well below -- 5 MS. FITZPATRICK: Well, strike 6 that. I think I already asked you 7 that. 8 Q. Now, this methodology that 9 you've just described, the two different 10 types of methodology, you used that same 11 methodology for each of the complications 12 that you reported in this medical article; 13 is that correct? 14 A. We did. 15 Q. Is it fair to say that this 16 medical article is -- identifies all of 17 the complications that you were able to 18 see that are reported in the medical 19 literature, correct? 20 A. From 2007 to 2014, yes. 21 Q. Now, what I want to ask you is 22 you identify in your Nature Review article 23 specific types of complications. 24 Are those complications that you</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 64</p> <p>1 of these complications is associated with 2 the polypropylene midurethral slings? 3 A. I mean, it's not a question that 4 the answer is "yes." 5 Q. Sometimes we ask stupid 6 questions. 7 A. Okay. 8 Q. It's 'cause we have to. 9 Now, you walked me through the 10 complication rates for retropubic slings, 11 and what I want to talk to you about is 12 your -- you've reached some opinions on 13 the risk of negative outcome after 14 synthetic midurethral sling implantation 15 for surgery is greater than or equal to 15 16 percent. 17 Do you recall that? 18 A. I do. 19 Q. Can you tell me the methodology 20 that you and your co-authors used to 21 determine that the overall risk of a 22 negative outcome after synthetic 23 midurethral sling implantation surgery is 24 greater than or equal to 15 percent?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 63</p> <p>1 have also seen with mesh synthetic sling 2 patients in your clinical practice or 3 through your academic experience? 4 A. Yes. 5 Q. In doing this work in 2014 and 6 2015, did you see any complications that 7 were reported here that you didn't also 8 have some clinical experience with? 9 A. Give me a moment. 10 (Pause.) 11 I'm amazed to say that no, I've 12 seen every one of these complications. 13 Q. And do you rely on your clinical 14 experience for your opinions that the 15 TVT-Exact and the Ethicon midurethral 16 slings can cause these types of 17 complications in women? 18 A. They do. 19 Q. In addition to your clinical 20 experience and in addition to what you 21 have presented in the Nature Review 22 article, do you also rely on other 23 peer-reviewed literature from other 24 authors to support your opinions that each</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 65</p> <p>1 A. Sure. First we looked at the 2 reported incidence that we already 3 described. Then we took the chances of 4 the failure of the sling, which would be a 5 negative consequence. So we took the 6 first number was the complications as we 7 reported them. The second number was the 8 chances of just failure, like any 9 operation can fail. The third was the 10 failure for stress incontinence after an 11 operation -- after a complication from a 12 sling, okay. And the fourth -- let me get 13 my numbers right. I think it's the 14 fourth. The fourth was the incidence of 15 refractory overactive bladder, and what we 16 did with that was that we made, again, a 17 very conservative estimate, okay. So we 18 took the number of reported de novo 19 overactive bladder patients and we said 20 that a certain percentage of them are 21 likely to be refractory. And because the 22 trouble is there is no data on that. 23 There's no data that says, that we could 24 find, that says that if you operate on</p>

Jerry G. Blaivas, M.D.

Page 66	Page 68
<p>1 them and they have de novo overactive 2 bladder and you treat them, X number would 3 get better. So I don't have the exact 4 number, but we picked the number of de 5 novo overactive bladder patients and then 6 we took a percentage of that, of patients 7 that are likely to be refractory, and when 8 you add all those numbers up -- then we 9 added a couple of -- there were a few 10 things like bowel injuries and fistulas 11 that are very rare, but we added in a 12 number of that and added all of those up, 13 the methodology, it's in the paper 14 someplace.</p> <p>15 Q. And that's the same methodology? 16 A. Yeah. 17 Q. Just so I understand, if I'm 18 looking at box 1 on page 8 of your 19 article. 20 A. Okay. 21 Q. It says: "Complications 22 requiring surgery." 23 Is this the list of 24 complications that you would consider a</p>	<p>1 A. I would say it another way. 2 That there's a, I believe, at least a 15 3 percent chance of having a negative 4 outcome from the sling, from putting the 5 sling in. 6 Q. And the negative outcomes would 7 be one of those things that you have 8 identified in Box 1? 9 A. Yes. 10 Q. But it's not your testimony, for 11 example, that 15.3 percent of women who 12 have a midurethral sling will have chronic 13 pain? 14 A. No. 15 Q. Or that 15.3 percent will have a 16 urethral obstruction, correct? 17 A. Correct. 18 Q. It's just the overall chances of 19 having one of these negative outcomes? 20 A. Yes. 21 Q. Now, going back in time, you 22 published this article in late 2015; is 23 that right? 24 A. Yes.</p>
Page 67	Page 69
<p>1 serious complication for the purposes of 2 calculating that 15.3 percent number? 3 A. Yes. 4 Q. Is it fair to say that, or am I 5 accurate in saying that that list of 6 complications, plus the number of sling 7 failures, the percentage of women whose 8 slings simply don't work for them, you 9 calculated that total -- 10 A. No, no, that's in there. The 11 recurrent and/or persistent stress 12 incontinence. 13 Q. Okay. 14 A. That number is -- that's where 15 the number comes from. 16 Q. Okay. Thank you for clarifying 17 that. 18 So, when you say there's a total 19 incidence of serious complications is 15.3 20 percent, is it accurate to say that's the 21 calculation of the overall risk to a woman 22 that one of these things could happen to 23 her if she has a polypropylene midurethral 24 sling implanted?</p>	<p>1 Q. And it was based on medical 2 records 2007 through 2014; is that right? 3 A. Yes. 4 Q. And do you recall that in the 5 summer of 2014, you testified in front of 6 Judge Goodwin in the Southern District of 7 West Virginia in a case involving Mrs. Joe 8 Husky; is that right? 9 A. I have a remote memory of it, 10 yes. 11 Q. Well, I put you on the stand, 12 so. 13 A. No, I did it. 14 Q. So I know that you did it. 15 And at that time, you had not 16 done the statistical analyses and this 17 analysis that's reflected in your Nature 18 article, correct? 19 A. I'm sorry, what was the date? 20 Q. Summer of 2014. 21 A. Correct. 22 Q. So, since you testified in Mrs. 23 Husky's case in the summer of 2014, have 24 you done additional work that you rely on</p>

Jerry G. Blaivas, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 70</p> <p>1 as the basis for your current opinions</p> <p>2 reflected in this expert report on the</p> <p>3 incidence of individual complications rate</p> <p>4 and the overall complication rate?</p> <p>5 A. Well, of course. That's what</p> <p>6 this paper is.</p> <p>7 Q. And this information wasn't</p> <p>8 available to you and you had not done this</p> <p>9 analysis at the time of Mrs. Husky's</p> <p>10 trial, correct?</p> <p>11 A. Correct.</p> <p>12 Q. Ethicon has made a statement</p> <p>13 that you may not -- I'm going to quote</p> <p>14 you: "Dr. Blaivas may not, quote, merely</p> <p>15 a year later, quote, purport to be certain</p> <p>16 about TVT complication rates."</p> <p>17 Can you tell me why you can be</p> <p>18 certain about complication rates in August</p> <p>19 of 2015 when you couldn't be certain about</p> <p>20 complication rates in the summer of 2014?</p> <p>21 A. Because we did such an</p> <p>22 exhaustive search of the literature and</p> <p>23 this is our best estimate of the minimum</p> <p>24 complication rate. I emphasize that.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 72</p> <p>1 A. No. I think if anything, it</p> <p>2 errs on the lower complication rate.</p> <p>3 Q. And is that reflected in the</p> <p>4 fact that both the complication percentage</p> <p>5 and the incidence that you report out are</p> <p>6 lower than the highest rates that you saw</p> <p>7 in the research that you did?</p> <p>8 A. Well, in part, but not --</p> <p>9 MS. FITZPATRICK: Take a break.</p> <p>10 (Discussion held off the record.)</p> <p>11 MS. FITZPATRICK: Can you read</p> <p>12 back the question and answer?</p> <p>13 (The requested portion of the</p> <p>14 record was read by the Court Reporter.)</p> <p>15 A. Yeah, because we don't expect it</p> <p>16 to be the highest rate reported, but we</p> <p>17 know that the studies, that the majority</p> <p>18 of the studies don't follow the patient</p> <p>19 long enough to account for all the</p> <p>20 complications and that there's no registry</p> <p>21 and there isn't -- and they don't -- there</p> <p>22 isn't a methodology to specifically look</p> <p>23 for complications. So because of those</p> <p>24 three things alone, it's very likely that</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 71</p> <p>1 Q. And when you call it an</p> <p>2 estimate, it's an estimate that is based</p> <p>3 on two different scientifically reliable</p> <p>4 means for calculating the rates of</p> <p>5 complication; is that right?</p> <p>6 A. Yes.</p> <p>7 Q. And those are the ones that are</p> <p>8 reflected in Tables 2, 3, 4 and 5 of the</p> <p>9 report?</p> <p>10 A. I'll take your word for it.</p> <p>11 Yes.</p> <p>12 Q. I just want to make sure that</p> <p>13 I'm right.</p> <p>14 A. Okay.</p> <p>15 Q. Dr. Blaivas, do you believe that</p> <p>16 the conclusions that you reached in your</p> <p>17 report and in your Nature article assume</p> <p>18 the worst case scenario?</p> <p>19 A. No. As I said, I think it</p> <p>20 assumes the best case scenario.</p> <p>21 Q. And do you believe that it errs</p> <p>22 on the side of opining as to a higher</p> <p>23 complication rate to better protect a</p> <p>24 patient?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 73</p> <p>1 the complication rate that we reported is</p> <p>2 an underestimate of the real number of the</p> <p>3 complications.</p> <p>4 Q. Now, Ethicon claims that your</p> <p>5 Review article cherry-picked data in</p> <p>6 failing to take into account long-term</p> <p>7 studies finding TVT complication rates to</p> <p>8 be much lower. And they then refer to the</p> <p>9 articles that are identified in Table 1</p> <p>10 and states that at Table 1 of the article,</p> <p>11 the authors collected 11 studies</p> <p>12 purportedly meeting the criteria for</p> <p>13 inclusion.</p> <p>14 Do those articles have to do</p> <p>15 with efficacy and your conclusions about</p> <p>16 efficacy, or do they have to do with the</p> <p>17 overall rates of complications?</p> <p>18 A. The methodology was primarily</p> <p>19 geared towards efficacy.</p> <p>20 Q. So, is it accurate to say that</p> <p>21 simply because something was not included</p> <p>22 in Table 1, it is incorrect for Ethicon to</p> <p>23 say that you did not take into account</p> <p>24 long-term studies that find TVT</p>

Jerry G. Blaivas, M.D.

Page 74	Page 76
<p>1 complication rates to be lower?</p> <p>2 A. I'm sorry, there was a couple of</p> <p>3 negatives in there. I'm not sure about</p> <p>4 that.</p> <p>5 Q. Okay. Ethicon attempts to use</p> <p>6 the fact that there were certain articles</p> <p>7 that you did not consider for efficacy as</p> <p>8 evidence that you did not use those</p> <p>9 articles for consideration of safety.</p> <p>10 Is that accurate?</p> <p>11 A. It's not accurate.</p> <p>12 Q. Why not?</p> <p>13 A. Because one thing I already</p> <p>14 alluded to is that we only counted the</p> <p>15 patients once. So if a patient -- I mean,</p> <p>16 for example, I know one of the articles in</p> <p>17 there -- when I say "know," let me just</p> <p>18 double check.</p> <p>19 (Pause.)</p> <p>20 For example, the Nielson</p> <p>21 article -- no, this doesn't answer your</p> <p>22 question. Excuse me.</p> <p>23 The answer is "no" because some</p> <p>24 of the papers that they cited in that --</p>	<p>1 A. I don't believe so.</p> <p>2 Q. Now, defendants claim that your</p> <p>3 opinion that the TVT has a minimal</p> <p>4 complication rate takes into account</p> <p>5 prolapse devices.</p> <p>6 Did you look at articles or</p> <p>7 consider statistics on prolapse devices</p> <p>8 when reaching your complication rate in</p> <p>9 this paper?</p> <p>10 A. We did not look at -- if a paper</p> <p>11 had -- it's possible that some of the</p> <p>12 papers had patients with both prolapse and</p> <p>13 slings, but in the review process, we</p> <p>14 would have made our best effort to only</p> <p>15 include those patients that had to do with</p> <p>16 sling -- that where the complication was</p> <p>17 from a sling.</p> <p>18 Q. Is it fair to say that Ethicon's</p> <p>19 claim that you included prolapse devices</p> <p>20 in calculating your complication rate is</p> <p>21 untrue?</p> <p>22 A. To the best of our ability to</p> <p>23 make the distinction, it's untrue.</p> <p>24 MS. FITZPATRICK: Can we go off</p>
Page 75	Page 77
<p>1 in that deposition or, I think it was a</p> <p>2 deposition, were papers that were</p> <p>3 duplicate, so they used the same patients</p> <p>4 twice, and I already testified that when</p> <p>5 that happens, we only counted the</p> <p>6 complication once.</p> <p>7 And the second thing is that if</p> <p>8 an article did not mention a complication,</p> <p>9 that it wasn't included. They didn't say</p> <p>10 that they even looked for it.</p> <p>11 And then thirdly, I do remember,</p> <p>12 again I don't remember the specifics, but</p> <p>13 there was one or two articles that didn't</p> <p>14 come up in our search, and I don't know,</p> <p>15 you know, we did a very methodical search,</p> <p>16 but we searched thousands of papers and</p> <p>17 it's not unexpected that one or two</p> <p>18 wouldn't come up with a search.</p> <p>19 Q. And is that something that</p> <p>20 routinely happens in peer-reviewed</p> <p>21 articles?</p> <p>22 A. Sure.</p> <p>23 Q. Does it call into question the</p> <p>24 reliability of a peer review article?</p>	<p>1 the record for a second?</p> <p>2 (Discussion held off the record.)</p> <p>3 BY MS. FITZPATRICK:</p> <p>4 Q. Dr. Blaivas, you participated in</p> <p>5 the committee at the AUA that considered</p> <p>6 the safety and efficacy of midurethral</p> <p>7 slings, correct?</p> <p>8 A. Yes.</p> <p>9 Q. Can you tell me what you did in</p> <p>10 that respect, what you personally did?</p> <p>11 A. Well, we all -- it was a</p> <p>12 complicated process, similar to what I</p> <p>13 testified before. We did a literature</p> <p>14 search. We had inclusion criteria. We</p> <p>15 selected papers that had to do with the</p> <p>16 surgical management of urinary</p> <p>17 incontinence in women. We selected the</p> <p>18 papers and we tabulated the data on safety</p> <p>19 and efficacy, very similar to what we did</p> <p>20 in the Nature Review article for that</p> <p>21 column in the right where we looked at the</p> <p>22 incidence and the range. And we did that</p> <p>23 for all of the known treatments to stress</p> <p>24 incontinence at the time, surgical</p>

Jerry G. Blaivas, M.D.

Page 78	Page 80
<p>1 treatments.</p> <p>2 Q. You didn't author those</p> <p>3 guidelines, correct?</p> <p>4 A. Well, I was one of eleven</p> <p>5 authors.</p> <p>6 Q. Do those guidelines reflect your</p> <p>7 personal opinions or the position of the</p> <p>8 AUA?</p> <p>9 A. It reflected the opinions of the</p> <p>10 AUA.</p> <p>11 Q. Did you disagree with some of</p> <p>12 those opinions?</p> <p>13 A. Yeah, I disagreed with some of</p> <p>14 the conclusions.</p> <p>15 Q. And did you express that during</p> <p>16 your meetings and to others?</p> <p>17 A. I did.</p> <p>18 Q. Is it fair to say that this</p> <p>19 though ended up being a consensus paper</p> <p>20 that doesn't fully and accurately reflect</p> <p>21 your personal views on the safety and</p> <p>22 efficacy of midurethral slings?</p> <p>23 A. That's correct. I was one</p> <p>24 eleven -- I had one-eleventh of the vote.</p>	<p>1 be -- that have no intention of being</p> <p>2 sexually active and whose life expectancy</p> <p>3 isn't that long, so, you know, older</p> <p>4 women, particularly those that can't</p> <p>5 withstand the rigors of an open operation,</p> <p>6 that are not going to be sexually active,</p> <p>7 particularly those that are obese will be</p> <p>8 a much bigger operation to do an</p> <p>9 autologous sling. I think those patients</p> <p>10 are reasonable candidates once -- if they</p> <p>11 accept and are informed of the risks.</p> <p>12 Q. Do you believe though that</p> <p>13 midurethral polypropylene slings are a</p> <p>14 safe first line surgical option for all</p> <p>15 women who suffer from stress urinary</p> <p>16 incontinence?</p> <p>17 A. Well, I don't think it's my job</p> <p>18 to decide for another patient. I don't</p> <p>19 believe -- for the patient. I think the</p> <p>20 patient and the -- the patient needs to be</p> <p>21 informed of the risks and benefits, and if</p> <p>22 they were informed of the risks and</p> <p>23 benefits, I think they would realize that</p> <p>24 it's not safe and it's not worth the risk.</p>
Page 79	Page 81
<p>1 Q. Now, did the AUA conclude that</p> <p>2 mesh products are suitable surgical</p> <p>3 alternatives?</p> <p>4 A. They did.</p> <p>5 Q. What is your opinion as to</p> <p>6 whether mesh products are suitable</p> <p>7 surgical options?</p> <p>8 A. I think they're suitable</p> <p>9 surgical options in a small percentage of</p> <p>10 patients who accept the known risks and</p> <p>11 complications and weigh the risks and</p> <p>12 benefits. But as I said, I contend that</p> <p>13 it's almost impossible to do that because</p> <p>14 those risks are not well-described and not</p> <p>15 well-known by either the doctors or the</p> <p>16 patients.</p> <p>17 Q. When you say it's a suitable</p> <p>18 surgical option in, did you say a limited</p> <p>19 number of patients?</p> <p>20 A. Yes.</p> <p>21 Q. Can you tell me what you mean by</p> <p>22 that?</p> <p>23 A. Well, I think in a -- first of</p> <p>24 all, in patients that are not going to</p>	<p>1 I might not have answered. What</p> <p>2 was the actual question?</p> <p>3 Q. You had said that you believed</p> <p>4 it was an appropriate surgical option for</p> <p>5 a limited number of patients. You</p> <p>6 identified who those patients were.</p> <p>7 What I was asking was do you</p> <p>8 believe that the Ethicon midurethral</p> <p>9 slings are a suitable safe surgical option</p> <p>10 as a first line treatment for all women</p> <p>11 who have stress urinary incontinence?</p> <p>12 A. I do not.</p> <p>13 Q. And is that based on your</p> <p>14 clinical experience in treating women who</p> <p>15 have mesh-related complications?</p> <p>16 A. Yes.</p> <p>17 Q. And is it based --</p> <p>18 A. Excuse me. And my knowledge of</p> <p>19 how likely they are to occur.</p> <p>20 Q. Is it based on your review of</p> <p>21 the medical literature discussing the</p> <p>22 potential complications and the incidence</p> <p>23 of complications that are associated with</p> <p>24 midurethral slings?</p>

Jerry G. Blaivas, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 82</p> <p>1 A. Yes.</p> <p>2 Q. And that includes a review of</p> <p>3 literature that reports few complications</p> <p>4 and literature that reports many</p> <p>5 complications, correct?</p> <p>6 A. Yes.</p> <p>7 Q. And you take into account for</p> <p>8 your opinions medical articles that report</p> <p>9 low rates of complications when reaching</p> <p>10 your opinions, correct?</p> <p>11 A. Yes.</p> <p>12 Q. And you took all of those into</p> <p>13 account, to the best of your ability, when</p> <p>14 conducting your Nature Review, correct?</p> <p>15 A. I did.</p> <p>16 Q. And you didn't exclude any such</p> <p>17 reports simply because they had a low</p> <p>18 incidence of complication reported in</p> <p>19 them, correct?</p> <p>20 A. Correct.</p> <p>21 Q. Do you also base that opinion on</p> <p>22 your clinical experience in implanting</p> <p>23 autologous slings or doing non-mesh</p> <p>24 surgery for SUI patients?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 84</p> <p>1 injections, and homologous and xeno --</p> <p>2 homologs and xenografts.</p> <p>3 Q. Does the AUA conclude that the</p> <p>4 or look at --</p> <p>5 MS. FITZPATRICK: Strike that.</p> <p>6 Q. Does the AUA conclude that the</p> <p>7 polypropylene midurethral sling is a safer</p> <p>8 surgical option to some of the non-mesh</p> <p>9 surgeries?</p> <p>10 A. It does not.</p> <p>11 Q. And does the AUA guidelines that</p> <p>12 you were involved with suggest that</p> <p>13 physicians such as yourself and others</p> <p>14 should only consider polypropylene</p> <p>15 midurethral slings as a suitable surgical</p> <p>16 option for --</p> <p>17 A. It does not.</p> <p>18 Q. In that respect, do you agree</p> <p>19 with the AUA that these non-mesh</p> <p>20 procedures are suitable surgical options</p> <p>21 for women who have stress urinary</p> <p>22 incontinence?</p> <p>23 A. Of course.</p> <p>24 Q. Separate and apart from what's</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 83</p> <p>1 A. Yes.</p> <p>2 Q. Do you also base your opinion on</p> <p>3 medical literature concerning the</p> <p>4 complications associated with the</p> <p>5 autologous fascial sling and other</p> <p>6 non-mesh surgeries to correct SUI?</p> <p>7 A. I do.</p> <p>8 Q. Now let's go back to the AUA.</p> <p>9 Does the AUA recognize an</p> <p>10 autologous fascial sling as a suitable</p> <p>11 surgical option for women who have stress</p> <p>12 urinary incontinence?</p> <p>13 A. It does.</p> <p>14 Q. Does it recognize other non-mesh</p> <p>15 procedures as suitable surgical options</p> <p>16 for women who have stress urinary</p> <p>17 incontinence?</p> <p>18 A. It does. Yes, it does.</p> <p>19 Q. And what are those?</p> <p>20 A. Autologous fascial sling, a</p> <p>21 Burch, it doesn't really -- also</p> <p>22 Marshall-Marchetti-Krantz, and other</p> <p>23 retropubic kind of operations and</p> <p>24 midurethral -- excuse me, periurethral</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 85</p> <p>1 reflected in the AUA, do you believe that</p> <p>2 the non-mesh surgical options, and</p> <p>3 particularly the autologous fascial sling,</p> <p>4 are safer procedures for women who have</p> <p>5 stress urinary incontinence generally?</p> <p>6 A. I do.</p> <p>7 Q. Tell me what the basis for that</p> <p>8 opinion is.</p> <p>9 A. Well, because the autologous</p> <p>10 slings simply don't have any of the</p> <p>11 devastating kind of complications that we</p> <p>12 talk about. For practical purposes, no</p> <p>13 refractory pain and there's, for practical</p> <p>14 purposes, no erosion, and for practical</p> <p>15 purposes, there's no fistulas. I mean,</p> <p>16 the really serious complications, the</p> <p>17 autologous sling does not have.</p> <p>18 Q. Now, Ethicon has asserted that</p> <p>19 you base your opinions on the benefits of</p> <p>20 autologous slings solely on your own</p> <p>21 unreliable personal experiences.</p> <p>22 Is that correct?</p> <p>23 A. I wonder why they call my</p> <p>24 published peer-reviewed articles</p>

Jerry G. Blaivas, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 86</p> <p>1 unreliable, but no, that's not correct.</p> <p>2 Q. What else do you base it on?</p> <p>3 A. The peer review literature and</p> <p>4 speaking with my associates.</p> <p>5 Q. Okay.</p> <p>6 A. My colleagues.</p> <p>7 Q. Is there any specific -- let me</p> <p>8 ask you this.</p> <p>9 When reaching your opinions</p> <p>10 concerning the safety of autologous</p> <p>11 fascial slings, did you consider all</p> <p>12 reported medical articles that you had</p> <p>13 seen concerning the complications rates</p> <p>14 associated with autologous fascial slings?</p> <p>15 A. I did.</p> <p>16 Q. And that formed one basis of</p> <p>17 your opinions, correct?</p> <p>18 A. Yes.</p> <p>19 Q. And you didn't simply adopt or</p> <p>20 form your opinion based on reading of a</p> <p>21 single article, correct?</p> <p>22 A. Correct.</p> <p>23 Q. Did you look at the totality of</p> <p>24 the articles out there that supported your</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 88</p> <p>1 complex.</p> <p>2 Q. And mesh degradation, have you</p> <p>3 seen mesh falling apart when you take it</p> <p>4 out of women?</p> <p>5 A. I have.</p> <p>6 Q. Is your clinical experience in</p> <p>7 observing each of these phenomenon a basis</p> <p>8 for your opinion that each of those things</p> <p>9 can happen?</p> <p>10 A. Yes.</p> <p>11 Q. In addition to your clinical</p> <p>12 experience, is this an issue that you also</p> <p>13 studied in your Nature Review article?</p> <p>14 A. Yes.</p> <p>15 Q. Did you rely on the conclusions</p> <p>16 that you reached in your Nature Review</p> <p>17 article as a separate basis for your</p> <p>18 conclusions about mesh degradation,</p> <p>19 shrinkage and deformation?</p> <p>20 A. I did.</p> <p>21 Q. And can you tell me what you and</p> <p>22 your co-authors did to study mesh</p> <p>23 degradation, shrinkage, and deformation in</p> <p>24 your Nature Review article?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 87</p> <p>1 opinions?</p> <p>2 A. I looked at the totality, but I</p> <p>3 also looked at the severity of the</p> <p>4 complications and there's no question in</p> <p>5 my mind that the severity of the</p> <p>6 complications on average are much worse in</p> <p>7 synthetic slings than in autologous</p> <p>8 slings.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay.</p> <p>10 A. And also the ease with which</p> <p>11 they can be corrected are much easier and</p> <p>12 predict -- more predictable in the</p> <p>13 autologous sling compared to the mesh</p> <p>14 sling.</p> <p>15 Q. Okay. Now, you offered opinions</p> <p>16 concerning mesh degradation, shrinkage and</p> <p>17 other deformation, correct?</p> <p>18 A. Yes.</p> <p>19 Q. Have you seen deformed mesh that</p> <p>20 you've explanted from women?</p> <p>21 A. Of course.</p> <p>22 Q. Have you seen mesh that's shrunk</p> <p>23 that you've explanted from women?</p> <p>24 A. Well, I've seen the mesh scar</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 89</p> <p>1 A. Well, Dr. Latovlev actually that</p> <p>2 did that. I mean, he wrote that part of</p> <p>3 the article, and he himself has done</p> <p>4 extensive studies both of a explanted mesh</p> <p>5 looking at the gross specimen for</p> <p>6 stiffness and deformation, looking at the</p> <p>7 light microscopic and also the</p> <p>8 ultramicroscopic characteristics of the</p> <p>9 mesh, and he concluded based on his own</p> <p>10 work and that of many others in the</p> <p>11 literature that mesh degrades in vivo.</p> <p>12 Q. Did he also conclude that mesh</p> <p>13 shrinks in vivo?</p> <p>14 A. Yes.</p> <p>15 Q. And did he also conclude that</p> <p>16 mesh can deform in vivo?</p> <p>17 A. Yes.</p> <p>18 Q. So you talked about what Dr.</p> <p>19 Latovlev did in your paper.</p> <p>20 Is there additional literature</p> <p>21 in the peer review that you are aware of</p> <p>22 that establishes that mesh can degrade,</p> <p>23 shrink and deform?</p> <p>24 A. Yes, there's a lot of -- there</p>

Jerry G. Blaivas, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 90</p> <p>1 are a number of studies in the literature.</p> <p>2 Q. Have you cited to those as part</p> <p>3 of your reliance list in this case?</p> <p>4 A. I have.</p> <p>5 Q. And those are the basis for your</p> <p>6 opinions?</p> <p>7 A. Yes.</p> <p>8 Q. I want to go back to just a</p> <p>9 general question.</p> <p>10 Ethicon has raised questions</p> <p>11 about the methodology that you have used</p> <p>12 to reach your opinions in this case.</p> <p>13 A. I'm sorry, I missed the first</p> <p>14 part of your sentence.</p> <p>15 Q. Ethicon has raised issues with</p> <p>16 the methodology that you have used to</p> <p>17 reach your opinions in this case.</p> <p>18 Did you rely on your clinical</p> <p>19 experience as part of your basis for each</p> <p>20 of the opinions that you hold?</p> <p>21 A. I did.</p> <p>22 Q. And did you rely on your own</p> <p>23 peer-reviewed literature as part of the</p> <p>24 basis for the opinions?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 92</p> <p>1 percent, at least, urethral obstruction,</p> <p>2 revision surgery. Those things are</p> <p>3 indisputable. There's no controversy</p> <p>4 about that.</p> <p>5 The only thing -- the only thing</p> <p>6 they could possibly argue with is the</p> <p>7 actual incidence.</p> <p>8 Q. And you've laid out for us what</p> <p>9 your methodology in calculating that</p> <p>10 incidence is, correct?</p> <p>11 A. I think in much greater detail</p> <p>12 than any of the other articles that talk</p> <p>13 about complications.</p> <p>14 Q. Let me just go back.</p> <p>15 Now, Ethicon is not here at this</p> <p>16 deposition today, correct?</p> <p>17 A. Correct.</p> <p>18 Q. Now, this deposition was</p> <p>19 originally noticed by Ethicon, and you are</p> <p>20 here in deposition today because Ethicon</p> <p>21 asked you to be in deposition, correct?</p> <p>22 A. Correct.</p> <p>23 Q. And if Ethicon had chosen to</p> <p>24 show up for this deposition, they could</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 91</p> <p>1 A. I did.</p> <p>2 Q. And did you rely on other peer</p> <p>3 review literature as part of the basis for</p> <p>4 your opinions in this case?</p> <p>5 A. I did.</p> <p>6 Q. Is it fair to say that each of</p> <p>7 your opinions depends on all three of</p> <p>8 those aspects of your experience as its</p> <p>9 bases?</p> <p>10 A. It did, but when I heard your</p> <p>11 question, I'm trying to understand.</p> <p>12 There's no controversy about whether these</p> <p>13 things exist except for possibly the</p> <p>14 degradation. Everything's well documented</p> <p>15 in the literature. I think the only thing</p> <p>16 they could possibly contest is how often</p> <p>17 that occurs, but the published literature,</p> <p>18 exclusive of anything that I said, I mean,</p> <p>19 we -- you know, we cited the New England</p> <p>20 Journal of Medicine, the Journal of</p> <p>21 Urology, the most reputable journals, you</p> <p>22 know, show, for example, a five to six</p> <p>23 percent incidence of perforation. Every</p> <p>24 review article has shown one or two</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 93</p> <p>1 have asked you any questions that they</p> <p>2 wanted based on your TVT-Exact report,</p> <p>3 correct?</p> <p>4 A. Yes.</p> <p>5 Q. And they chose not to do so</p> <p>6 today?</p> <p>7 A. I believe so.</p> <p>8 MS. FITZPATRICK: That's all</p> <p>9 that I've got.</p> <p>10 I just would like to mark as</p> <p>11 Exhibit 2 the original notice of</p> <p>12 deposition of Dr. Blaivas from Ethicon</p> <p>13 that was dated August 25th, 2016.</p> <p>14 (Blaivas Exhibit 2, Notice To</p> <p>15 Take Deposition of Jerry Blaivas, M.D.</p> <p>16 dated August 25, 2016, was marked for</p> <p>17 identification, as of this date.)</p> <p>18 MS. FITZPATRICK: And mark as</p> <p>19 Exhibit 3 the amended notice to take</p> <p>20 the deposition of Dr. Blaivas that we</p> <p>21 filed today, August 29th, immediately</p> <p>22 following Ethicon's withdrawal of its</p> <p>23 notice.</p> <p>24 (Blaivas Exhibit 3, Amended</p>